

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 11-29 and 31 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 14, 16, 20 and 22 are amended above to more clearly set forth what it is that the applicants regard as their invention.

Claims 14, 16 and 28 are amended above to overcome the examiner's objection to certain language used in the claims. New claim 31 has been added to the application. No new matter has been added to the application by these claim amendments.

The examiner's claim objections and rejections are overcome or they are traversed as set forth below.

I. THE SECTION 112, 2nd PARAGRAPH REJECTION

The examiner objected to claims 8-11, 14, 15-22 and 28 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The examiner's objections are overcome as follows:

- The examiner's objection with respect to claim 8-10 are moot. Claims 8-10 are cancelled from the application in this Reply.
- Claims 11, 16 and 19 are amended above to cancel the term "and combinations thereof". This amendment to claim 16 overcomes the examiner's rejection of claims 17-22 which depend upon claim 16.
- Claims 14 and 28 are amended to provide antecedent basis for the term "a hook on the locking bracket".

II. TRAVERSE OF THE ANTICIPATION REJECTION

The examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11-16, 18-24 and 26-28 for being anticipated by Rosenblatt (USP 3,424,223). The examiner's anticipation rejection with respect to claims 1-3, 5, 11-15 and 22-24 are moot in view of the amendment of claim 1 above to include the feature of claim 10.

The examiner's rejection of claims 7-9 is moot. Claims 7-9 are cancelled from the application in this Reply.

Claims 16-21 and 26-28 are novel over Rosenblatt. Claims 16 is amended above to include the feature whereby the cable system includes at least one intermediate cable support selected from a hinge or from a vertical standoff bracket. Rosenblatt does not disclose or suggest either type of intermediate cable support. Support for the vertical standoff bracket is found in the specification at page 14, lines 9-13 as well as in Figures 3A-3B.

III. TRAVERSE OF THE OBVIOUSNESS REJECTIONS

The examiner rejected several of the claims for being obvious over Rosenblatt alone (claims 6, 25 and 29-30), or in view of Romanelli, (claims 4 and 17) or in view of Coluccio (claim 10).

Claim 1 is amended above to include the feature of claim 10. Therefore, the examiner's obviousness rejection of claim 10 now applies to pending application claims 1-7, 11-15 and 22-25.

Claims 1-7, 11-15 and 22-25 are not obvious over Rosenblatt in view of Coluccio. It is the examiner's position that Coluccio discloses a reinforced overhead door comprising an intermediate support including a first and second hinge pins 48. Pins 48 of Coluccio are not part of a hinge. Pins 48 are part of guide brackets 46, (column 2, lines 24-29 of Coluccio). The Coluccio apparatus

does include a hinge 18 of Figure 2. However, hinge 18 and brackets 46 are separate and distinct elements of the Coluccio apparatus.

Claim 1 is now directed to a cable system including hinges that double as intermediate cable supports. In this capacity, the hinges of the patent invention perform two functions. First, the hinges unite adjacent horizontal garage door panels and secondly, the hinges are constructed in a manner such that they retain the cable of the cable system. A hinge that performs these dual purposes is not disclosed or suggested by Coluccio or any other the prior art reference of record.

Claims 1-7, 11-15 and 22-25 are also patentable because the examiner has improperly combined Coluccio with Rosenblatt in rejecting claim 10. Coluccio is not directed to same field of technology nor is it directed to solving the same problems as Rosenblatt or the present invention. The present invention is directed to garage door cable systems that are useful to secure the doors in case of hurricanes and high winds. The Coluccio reference is directed to panel doors on trucks and to systems for dampening the vibration of those doors while the trucks are being driven. One of ordinary skill in the art faced with the applicants problem would not have been motivated to consider truck door vibration systems prior art in solving their problems. Moreover, the examiner has not recited any grounds for justifying the combination of Rosenblatt with Coluccio. For this reason, claims 1-7, 11-15 and 22-25 are nonobvious and patentable over the prior art.

Claims 17, 25 and 29 are nonobvious for the same reasons given for claims 16-21 and 26-28 in Section II above.

IV. CLAIMS 12 AND 20 ARE PATENTABLE

Claims 12 and 20 are amended above to limit the cable used in the cable system to a non-contiguous cable. The use of non-contiguous cables is not disclosed or suggested in any other prior art references cited by the examiner. Claims 12 and 20 are patentable for at least this reason.

V. NEW CLAIM 31

The applicants have added new claim 31 into the application. New claim 31 incorporates and expands upon the feature of cancelled claim 30. Namely, new claim 31 is directed to an overhead door including a plurality of cable systems. In claim 31, hinges are used to support cable that is passed between a header bracket and floor assembly of each cable system. The use of hinges for this purpose renders the claims patentable for at least the reasons indicated above in Sections II and III. Moreover, the use of a plurality of cable systems, wherein one cable system is associated with hinges at the center of the garage door panels and wherein at least a second cable system is associated with hinges located at an intermediate hinge position on the overhead door is not disclosed or suggested in the prior art. In particular, it is the applicant's use of hinges as intermediate cable support that make the use of multiple cable systems associated with hinges possible in the first place. For each of these reasons, new claim 31 is believed to be patentable over the prior art of record.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-6, 11-29 and 31 are believed to be patentable over the prior art of record for the reasons indicated above. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of all pending application claims is, therefore, courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF/LLP**

Dated: February 9, 2006

By: 

A. Blair Hughes
Reg. No. 32,901
312-913-2123